

## Interview Summary

Application No.

08/905,501

Applicant(s)

Scroggie et al.

Examiner

Hani Kazimi

Group Art Unit

2765



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hani Kazimi

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Richard A. Neifeld

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 5, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

An agreement was reached to file an amendment which over comes the restriction requirement under the doctrine of election by original presentation. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required. Claims 32-55, 58-81, 84-107, and 111-114 are drawn to a method for providing purchasing incentives to consumers, claims 56, 57, 82, 83, 108-110, and 115-120 are drawn to a method for adding data identifying products purchased by a consumer in association with data uniquely identifying the consumer in a database, and claims 121-129 are drawn to a method for generating a web page. Also, an agreement was reached to amend the independent claims to include the steps of generating page data defining a personal web page, and assigning a web page address to the personal web page based upon personal information data including an identity code. Finally the preamble of the independent claims was discussed to replace the word "providing" with "determining" to connect the preamble to the body of the claim.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.